

UCLA Faculty Association

News and opinion from Dan Mitchell since 2009

HomeAbout

Saturday, March 1, 2025

Overbilling

We have noted from time to time the issue of Medicare Advantage as part of UC's offerings of retiree health insurance. Medicare Advantage plans are privatized versions of Medicare. In principle, they provide whatever benefits traditional Medicare would provide, but with add-ons such as gym memberships.

Insurance companies have aggressively gone after Medicare Advantage business with TV ads, etc., all of which suggests they are being overpaid by Medicare, particularly because they are offering bargain rates to participants. Congress is getting curious about all of this and is coming to believe it is providing an excess subsidy. From the [Wall St. Journal](#):

Sen. Chuck Grassley, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, sent UnitedHealth Group CEO Andrew Witty a letter demanding detailed information on the company's Medicare billing practices [last] Monday. The letter—which cited findings from a series of Wall Street Journal articles published over the last year—said "the apparent fraud, waste, and abuse at issue is simply unacceptable and harms not only Medicare beneficiaries, but also the American taxpayer."

A Journal data analysis found UnitedHealth was paid billions of dollars based on diagnoses the company added to patients' Medicare records, even though their doctors hadn't treated the conditions. Under Medicare Advantage, the private version of the federal program, the insurers that oversee patients' benefits get bigger payments when people are diagnosed with certain illnesses...

Full story at <https://www.wsj.com/health/healthcare/sen-grassley-launches-inquiry-into-unitedhealth-groups-medicare-billing-practices-ad63a53c>.

As blog readers will know, at one point UC wanted to put all of its Medicare-eligible retirees into a Medicare Advantage plan. After a brouhaha about that goal, the system instead offered a Medicare Advantage program through UnitedHealthcare as a low-cost UC option. Whether it can remain a low-cost option remains to be seen.



Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM No comments:    

Labels: [health care](#), [uc retirement](#)

The Visit



From a DOJ news release of 2/28/25:

The Federal Task Force to Combat Anti-Semitism announced that it will be visiting 10 university campuses that have experienced antisemitic incidents since October 2023. Created pursuant to President Trump's Executive Order on Additional Measures to Combat Anti-

Semitism, the Task Force set as its first priority to eradicate antisemitic harassment in schools and on college campuses...

The 10 universities identified by the Task Force are: Columbia University; George Washington University; Harvard University; Johns Hopkins University; New York University; Northwestern University; the University of California, Los Angeles; the University of California, Berkeley; the University of Minnesota; and the University of Southern California...

Full release at <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/federal-task-force-combat-antisemitism-announces-visits-10-college-campus-experienced>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments:    

The Council of UC Faculty Associations

- [We Support AB-672, A First Step Towards Protecting PERB's Authority](#)
- [Emergency Day of Action March 19, Noon](#)
- [Council of UC Faculty Associations Resolution Against ICE Raids and Deportations](#)
- [Faculty Association Town Hall on Funding Cuts – March 13 at 6pm](#)
- [Once Again, It's Time for California to Lead](#)

Remaking the University

- [Where There are No Universities \(Guest Post\) - 3/31/2025](#)
- [Finding "Dear Colleagues" within the Autocratic Academy \(Guest Post\) - 3/28/2025](#)
- [Liner Note 20: After Columbia's Betrayal - 3/22/2025](#)

Higher Ed. News & Commentary

- [Chronicle of Higher Education](#)
- [Inside Higher Education](#)
- [Remaking the University](#)
- [Changing Universities](#)
- [California Professor](#)

Search This Blog

UC Faculty Associations

- [UCLA Faculty Association](#)
- [UCSB Faculty Association](#)
- [UCSC Faculty Association](#)
- [UCB Faculty Association](#)
- [Council of UC Faculty Associations](#)

Other Faculty Organizations

- [American Association of University Professors](#)
- [California Faculty Association \(NEA\)](#)
- [UC-AFT](#)

Topics

[UC \(1942\)](#) [politics \(1844\)](#) [UC Regents \(1798\)](#) [health care \(1349\)](#) [State Budget \(1230\)](#) [governor \(1071\)](#) [UC budget crisis \(934\)](#) [UC-Berkeley \(867\)](#) [diversity \(692\)](#) [pension \(649\)](#) [pensions \(589\)](#) [tuition \(521\)](#) [admissions \(508\)](#) [athletics \(481\)](#) [CSU \(393\)](#) [transportation \(376\)](#) [UC-Davis \(368\)](#) [online education \(337\)](#) [ucrp \(295\)](#) [uc retirement \(294\)](#) [UCOP \(292\)](#) [audio \(288\)](#) [new hotel-conference center \(282\)](#) [traffic \(281\)](#) [UC enrollment \(276\)](#)

Labels: Columbia, George Washington U, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Northwestern U, NYU, U of Minnesota, UC-Berkeley, UCLA, USC

Friday, February 28, 2025

Legit

UC has hired UnifyHR* to operate a Family Member Reverification process (FMEV) for verification of your family members (if any) eligible for UC benefits.

This verification will involve several types of communications from UnifyHR. It will be important NOT to treat such communications as a SCAM!

See the web site: <https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/benefits/understanding-your-benefits/eligibility/family-member-eligibility-verification/>.

===

*<https://www.unifyhr.com/>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM

No comments:

Labels: health care, UC

Less than you might have thought

You may have read that a judge blocked the anti-DEI rulings of the Trump administration as they applied to higher ed. Apparently, however, there was less to that ruling than you might have thought. From [Inside Higher Ed](#):

...The plaintiffs who challenged the anti-DEI orders say the four-page [Dept. of Education] guidance letter is "inconsistent" with the judge's ruling, which found that the language in the two anti-DEI executive orders was unconstitutionally vague. The judge blocked the Trump administration from terminating "equity-related" grants and investigating wealthy colleges.

But the department says the injunction does not cover its guidance document. Outside higher education lawyers largely agree with the department and suggest that colleges should still prepare to comply. "My short-term or abbreviated thought would be to proceed with caution," said Jackson Sharman III, a partner at Lightfoot, Franklin & White LLC.

Craig Trainor, acting assistant secretary for civil rights, doesn't think there should be any confusion after the injunction. He said in a statement to Inside Higher Ed that the letter was based on federal law, such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color or national origin, and the equal protection clause in the Constitution—not the president's executive orders.

"While additional guidance is forthcoming, this isn't complicated," he said. "When in doubt, every school should consult the SFFA legal test contained in the DCL: 'If an educational institution treats a person of one race differently than it treats another person because of that person's race, the educational institution violates the law.'" ...

Full story at <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/government/politics-elections/2025/02/25/education-dept-dei-guidance-unaaffected-court-order>.

Here is what UC had to say about the letter:

...UC leadership across the system is working with members of our community to evaluate the potential impact and implications of the letter and will provide updates or guidance as appropriate. As many in our community are aware, the University of California has been operating under longstanding state law requirements and does not consider race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in our practices...

Source: https://ucop.edu/communications/_files/dei-program-letter-us-dept-of-education.pdf.

Translation: Because of the fact that California's anti-affirmative action Prop 209 is in effect, UC is already in compliance with the letter.

Will that rationale fly? Who knows?

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM

No comments:

Labels: diversity, politics, UC

enrollment (251) UC-San Diego (241) community colleges (232) LAO (217) UC-Irvine (180) fund raising (161) UC-San Francisco (149) UC-Santa Barbara (149) UC-Santa Cruz (148) controller (139) faculty center (137) UC-Riverside (132) ballot propositions (132) CalPERS (120) UC-Merced (107) faculty pay (107) Master Plan (102) Yudof (89) UCRS retirement (60) Faculty Association at UCLA (59) parking (59) privatization (59) CalSTRS (50) UC Berkeley (33) copyright (30) campus climate survey (28) UCRS (21) Michigan Model (18) UC Merced (17) uc funding (16) State Contribution (14) UCOF (14) Regents (13) faculty recruitment (12) UC pay (7) graduate education (6) UC San Diego (5) UC Irvine (3) UCpolitics (3) teaching evaluation (3) UC Santa Cruz (2)

Blog Archive

▼ 2025 (242)

▼ April (2)

Watch the Regents Meeting of March 20, 2025

New Subway Notice

► March (83)

► February (76)

► January (81)

► 2024 (832)

► 2023 (828)

► 2022 (719)

► 2021 (710)

► 2020 (914)

► 2019 (671)

► 2018 (595)

► 2017 (666)

► 2016 (715)

► 2015 (765)

► 2014 (704)

► 2013 (776)

► 2012 (839)

► 2011 (738)

► 2010 (431)

► 2009 (12)

Contributors

California Policy Issues

Toby Higbie

UCLA Faculty Association

<https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/search?updated-max=2025-03-02T03:30:00-08:00&max-results=7&reverse-paginate=true&start=42&by-da...> 2/5